

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-10, 13, 15, 17-22, 24, and 26-29 have been canceled (claim 25 was previously canceled). Claims 11, 12, 14, and 23 have been amended. Claims 30-36 have been newly added. No new matter has been added. Applicants hereby respectfully request a telephone interview with the Examiner to be held before the Examiner's issuance of an office action in response to this RCE.

Claim Rejections

Independent claims 11, 12, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Lewis (U.S. Patent no. 6,378,066). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 11, as currently amended, recites:

11. (Currently amended) A method comprising:
running a plurality of tasks in a multiprocessor system;
implicitly synchronizing the tasks with regard to shared resources in said system by associating said tasks with scheduling domains, wherein each of the shared resources is assigned to one of the scheduling domains;
prohibiting tasks that are each associated with a same scheduling domain from running concurrently;
allowing tasks that are each associated with different scheduling domains to run concurrently; and
changing association of a task of the plurality of tasks from a first scheduling domain to a second scheduling domain, if the task requests a shared resource assigned to the second scheduling domain.
(Emphasis added).

In contrast, Lewis does not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitation. Lewis discloses a method of solving data dependency problems among a number of tasks. As discussed in Lewis's abstract, lines 50-57 of column 5, and line 66 of column 5 though line 3 of column 36, Lewis discloses dividing a memory region into a number of blocks, each block storing data needed for solving a problem. For each block, a program code is specified to be executed on the values within the block. Dependencies among

the blocks are specified for scheduling the processing order of these blocks. If a first block is dependent on a second block, the second block must be processed before the first block may be processed.

The Examiner alleges that Lewis's column 12, lines 15-46 teach or suggest changing association for a task of the plurality of tasks from a first scheduling domain to a second scheduling domain. The cited section discusses a tool that allows a user to more easily designate multiple block dependencies. The cited section, however, contains no discussion or indication of changing a task's association with scheduling domains, much less any discussion or indication of changing the association in response to the task's request for a resource that is associated or assigned to the scheduling domain to which the association is changed.

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, Lewis does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 is not rendered obvious in view of Lewis. Claim 11 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Lewis.

All other independent claims each recite a similar limitation as discussed above for claim 11. Thus, these other independent claims and all claims which depend on them are also patentable over Lewis.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 26, 2007



Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 48102
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300